



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

JUN 23 2017

OFFICE OF
POLICY

The Honorable John Barrasso
Chairman, Committee on the Environment
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Thank you for your letter regarding the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's efforts in response to Executive Orders 13777 and 13783. As part of President Trump's agenda, we are evaluating a variety of ways to bring more balance to the work of the Agency. In particular, we are refocusing the EPA on its intended mission, restoring cooperative federalism, and redesigning sensible regulations for economic growth while protecting the environment for future generations. As we develop regulatory policies, we will be sure to devote particular attention to the issues of cost-benefit analysis and the review process.

As part of our implementation of Executive Order 13777, on April 11, 2017, the EPA established a Regulatory Reform Task Force and launched a robust request for public feedback on its evaluation of existing regulations. Program offices held 11 public meetings to receive input that could inform the regulatory review. More than 200,000 stakeholders were independently invited to participate, and nearly half a million comments were received in the public comment docket. This enthusiastic response from homeowners, small businesses, small governments, and other regulated entities has provided a springboard for identifying unnecessary and overly burdensome regulations.

The calculation of a regulation's costs and benefits is a vital component of the rulemaking process. Assumptions and procedures must be transparent and supported by the best available science and economics. The use of such obscure metrics as the "social cost of carbon" and "co-benefits" undermines regulatory certainty and imposes unnecessary costs on American citizens and businesses. In recognition of these facts, Executive Order 13783 directed Administrator Pruitt to review the use of the social cost of carbon and withdrew several policy documents based on it.

Finally, Congress has established statutory review processes that reflect the best interests of our country. The Unfunded Mandate Reform Act (P.L. 104-4) and the Regulatory Flexibility Act (P.L. 96-534) ensure that the interests of small businesses and different levels of government are incorporated into the rulemaking process. Additionally, the Executive Branch established another safeguard against federal overreach in Executive Order 13132: Federalism. These review processes were set in place for a reason and must be incorporated into EPA regulations.

Thank you again for your letter and partnership in the work of the EPA. We greatly appreciate your leadership on the Senate Committee on the Environment and Public Works and look forward to joining together to make the federal government work better for the American people. If you have further questions, please contact me or your staff may contact Thea Williams in the EPA's Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations at williams.thea@epa.gov or (202) 564-2064.

Sincerely,



Samantha Dravis
Senior Counsel and Associate Administrator



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

JUN 23 2017

OFFICE OF
POLICY

The Honorable Joni Ernst
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Ernst:

Thank you for your letter regarding the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's efforts in response to Executive Orders 13777 and 13783. As part of President Trump's agenda, we are evaluating a variety of ways to bring more balance to the work of the Agency. In particular, we are refocusing the EPA on its intended mission, restoring cooperative federalism, and redesigning sensible regulations for economic growth while protecting the environment for future generations. As we develop regulatory policies, we will be sure to devote particular attention to the issues of cost-benefit analysis and the review process.

As part of our implementation of Executive Order 13777, on April 11, 2017, the EPA established a Regulatory Reform Task Force and launched a robust request for public feedback on its evaluation of existing regulations. Program offices held 11 public meetings to receive input that could inform the regulatory review. More than 200,000 stakeholders were independently invited to participate, and nearly half a million comments were received in the public comment docket. This enthusiastic response from homeowners, small businesses, small governments, and other regulated entities has provided a springboard for identifying unnecessary and overly burdensome regulations.

The calculation of a regulation's costs and benefits is a vital component of the rulemaking process. Assumptions and procedures must be transparent and supported by the best available science and economics. The use of such obscure metrics as the "social cost of carbon" and "co-benefits" undermines regulatory certainty and imposes unnecessary costs on American citizens and businesses. In recognition of these facts, Executive Order 13783 directed Administrator Pruitt to review the use of the social cost of carbon and withdrew several policy documents based on it.

Finally, Congress has established statutory review processes that reflect the best interests of our country. The Unfunded Mandate Reform Act (P.L. 104-4) and the Regulatory Flexibility Act (P.L. 96-534) ensure that the interests of small businesses and different levels of government are incorporated into the rulemaking process. Additionally, the Executive Branch established another safeguard against federal overreach in Executive Order 13132: Federalism. These review processes were set in place for a reason and must be incorporated into EPA regulations.

Thank you again for your letter and partnership in the work of the EPA. We greatly appreciate your leadership on the Senate Committee on the Environment and Public Works and look forward to joining

together to make the federal government work better for the American people. If you have further questions, please contact me or your staff may contact Thea Williams in the EPA's Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations at williams.thea@epa.gov or (202) 564-2064.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Samantha K. Dravis". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized "S" and "D".

Samantha Dravis
Senior Counsel and Associate Administrator



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

JUN 23 2017

OFFICE OF
POLICY

The Honorable Shelley Moore Capito
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Capito:

Thank you for your letter regarding the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's efforts in response to Executive Orders 13777 and 13783. As part of President Trump's agenda, we are evaluating a variety of ways to bring more balance to the work of the Agency. In particular, we are refocusing the EPA on its intended mission, restoring cooperative federalism, and redesigning sensible regulations for economic growth while protecting the environment for future generations. As we develop regulatory policies, we will be sure to devote particular attention to the issues of cost-benefit analysis and the review process.

As part of our implementation of Executive Order 13777, on April 11, 2017, the EPA established a Regulatory Reform Task Force and launched a robust request for public feedback on its evaluation of existing regulations. Program offices held 11 public meetings to receive input that could inform the regulatory review. More than 200,000 stakeholders were independently invited to participate, and nearly half a million comments were received in the public comment docket. This enthusiastic response from homeowners, small businesses, small governments, and other regulated entities has provided a springboard for identifying unnecessary and overly burdensome regulations.

The calculation of a regulation's costs and benefits is a vital component of the rulemaking process. Assumptions and procedures must be transparent and supported by the best available science and economics. The use of such obscure metrics as the "social cost of carbon" and "co-benefits" undermines regulatory certainty and imposes unnecessary costs on American citizens and businesses. In recognition of these facts, Executive Order 13783 directed Administrator Pruitt to review the use of the social cost of carbon and withdrew several policy documents based on it.

Finally, Congress has established statutory review processes that reflect the best interests of our country. The Unfunded Mandate Reform Act (P.L. 104-4) and the Regulatory Flexibility Act (P.L. 96-534) ensure that the interests of small businesses and different levels of government are incorporated into the rulemaking process. Additionally, the Executive Branch established another safeguard against federal overreach in Executive Order 13132: Federalism. These review processes were set in place for a reason and must be incorporated into EPA regulations.

Thank you again for your letter and partnership in the work of the EPA. We greatly appreciate your leadership on the Senate Committee on the Environment and Public Works and look forward to joining

together to make the federal government work better for the American people. If you have further questions, please contact me or your staff may contact Thea Williams in the EPA's Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations at williams.thea@epa.gov or (202) 564-2064.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Samantha K. Dravis". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Samantha Dravis
Senior Counsel and Associate Administrator



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

JUN 23 2017

OFFICE OF
POLICY

The Honorable Roger Wicker
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Wicker:

Thank you for your letter regarding the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's efforts in response to Executive Orders 13777 and 13783. As part of President Trump's agenda, we are evaluating a variety of ways to bring more balance to the work of the Agency. In particular, we are refocusing the EPA on its intended mission, restoring cooperative federalism, and redesigning sensible regulations for economic growth while protecting the environment for future generations. As we develop regulatory policies, we will be sure to devote particular attention to the issues of cost-benefit analysis and the review process.

As part of our implementation of Executive Order 13777, on April 11, 2017, the EPA established a Regulatory Reform Task Force and launched a robust request for public feedback on its evaluation of existing regulations. Program offices held 11 public meetings to receive input that could inform the regulatory review. More than 200,000 stakeholders were independently invited to participate, and nearly half a million comments were received in the public comment docket. This enthusiastic response from homeowners, small businesses, small governments, and other regulated entities has provided a springboard for identifying unnecessary and overly burdensome regulations.

The calculation of a regulation's costs and benefits is a vital component of the rulemaking process. Assumptions and procedures must be transparent and supported by the best available science and economics. The use of such obscure metrics as the "social cost of carbon" and "co-benefits" undermines regulatory certainty and imposes unnecessary costs on American citizens and businesses. In recognition of these facts, Executive Order 13783 directed Administrator Pruitt to review the use of the social cost of carbon and withdrew several policy documents based on it.

Finally, Congress has established statutory review processes that reflect the best interests of our country. The Unfunded Mandate Reform Act (P.L. 104-4) and the Regulatory Flexibility Act (P.L. 96-534) ensure that the interests of small businesses and different levels of government are incorporated into the rulemaking process. Additionally, the Executive Branch established another safeguard against federal overreach in Executive Order 13132: Federalism. These review processes were set in place for a reason and must be incorporated into EPA regulations.

Thank you again for your letter and partnership in the work of the EPA. We greatly appreciate your leadership on the Senate Committee on the Environment and Public Works and look forward to joining

together to make the federal government work better for the American people. If you have further questions, please contact me or your staff may contact Thea Williams in the EPA's Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations at williams.thea@epa.gov or (202) 564-2064.

Sincerely,



Samantha Dravis
Senior Counsel and Associate Administrator



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

JUN 23 2017

OFFICE OF
POLICY

The Honorable Deb (Debra) Fischer
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Fischer:

Thank you for your letter regarding the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's efforts in response to Executive Orders 13777 and 13783. As part of President Trump's agenda, we are evaluating a variety of ways to bring more balance to the work of the Agency. In particular, we are refocusing the EPA on its intended mission, restoring cooperative federalism, and redesigning sensible regulations for economic growth while protecting the environment for future generations. As we develop regulatory policies, we will be sure to devote particular attention to the issues of cost-benefit analysis and the review process.

As part of our implementation of Executive Order 13777, on April 11, 2017, the EPA established a Regulatory Reform Task Force and launched a robust request for public feedback on its evaluation of existing regulations. Program offices held 11 public meetings to receive input that could inform the regulatory review. More than 200,000 stakeholders were independently invited to participate, and nearly half a million comments were received in the public comment docket. This enthusiastic response from homeowners, small businesses, small governments, and other regulated entities has provided a springboard for identifying unnecessary and overly burdensome regulations.

The calculation of a regulation's costs and benefits is a vital component of the rulemaking process. Assumptions and procedures must be transparent and supported by the best available science and economics. The use of such obscure metrics as the "social cost of carbon" and "co-benefits" undermines regulatory certainty and imposes unnecessary costs on American citizens and businesses. In recognition of these facts, Executive Order 13783 directed Administrator Pruitt to review the use of the social cost of carbon and withdrew several policy documents based on it.

Finally, Congress has established statutory review processes that reflect the best interests of our country. The Unfunded Mandate Reform Act (P.L. 104-4) and the Regulatory Flexibility Act (P.L. 96-534) ensure that the interests of small businesses and different levels of government are incorporated into the rulemaking process. Additionally, the Executive Branch established another safeguard against federal overreach in Executive Order 13132: Federalism. These review processes were set in place for a reason and must be incorporated into EPA regulations.

Thank you again for your letter and partnership in the work of the EPA. We greatly appreciate your leadership on the Senate Committee on the Environment and Public Works and look forward to joining

together to make the federal government work better for the American people. If you have further questions, please contact me or your staff may contact Thea Williams in the EPA's Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations at williams.thea@epa.gov or (202) 564-2064.

Sincerely,



Samantha Dravis
Senior Counsel and Associate Administrator



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

JUN 23 2017

OFFICE OF
POLICY

The Honorable James M. Inhofe
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Inhofe:

Thank you for your letter regarding the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's efforts in response to Executive Orders 13777 and 13783. As part of President Trump's agenda, we are evaluating a variety of ways to bring more balance to the work of the Agency. In particular, we are refocusing the EPA on its intended mission, restoring cooperative federalism, and redesigning sensible regulations for economic growth while protecting the environment for future generations. As we develop regulatory policies, we will be sure to devote particular attention to the issues of cost-benefit analysis and the review process.

As part of our implementation of Executive Order 13777, on April 11, 2017, the EPA established a Regulatory Reform Task Force and launched a robust request for public feedback on its evaluation of existing regulations. Program offices held 11 public meetings to receive input that could inform the regulatory review. More than 200,000 stakeholders were independently invited to participate, and nearly half a million comments were received in the public comment docket. This enthusiastic response from homeowners, small businesses, small governments, and other regulated entities has provided a springboard for identifying unnecessary and overly burdensome regulations.

The calculation of a regulation's costs and benefits is a vital component of the rulemaking process. Assumptions and procedures must be transparent and supported by the best available science and economics. The use of such obscure metrics as the "social cost of carbon" and "co-benefits" undermines regulatory certainty and imposes unnecessary costs on American citizens and businesses. In recognition of these facts, Executive Order 13783 directed Administrator Pruitt to review the use of the social cost of carbon and withdrew several policy documents based on it.

Finally, Congress has established statutory review processes that reflect the best interests of our country. The Unfunded Mandate Reform Act (P.L. 104-4) and the Regulatory Flexibility Act (P.L. 96-534) ensure that the interests of small businesses and different levels of government are incorporated into the rulemaking process. Additionally, the Executive Branch established another safeguard against federal overreach in Executive Order 13132: Federalism. These review processes were set in place for a reason and must be incorporated into EPA regulations.

Thank you again for your letter and partnership in the work of the EPA. We greatly appreciate your leadership on the Senate Committee on the Environment and Public Works and look forward to joining

together to make the federal government work better for the American people. If you have further questions, please contact me or your staff may contact Thea Williams in the EPA's Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations at williams.thea@epa.gov or (202) 564-2064.

Sincerely,



Samantha Dravis
Senior Counsel and Associate Administrator



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

JUN 23 2017

OFFICE OF
POLICY

The Honorable Michael Rounds
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Rounds:

Thank you for your letter regarding the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's efforts in response to Executive Orders 13777 and 13783. As part of President Trump's agenda, we are evaluating a variety of ways to bring more balance to the work of the Agency. In particular, we are refocusing the EPA on its intended mission, restoring cooperative federalism, and redesigning sensible regulations for economic growth while protecting the environment for future generations. As we develop regulatory policies, we will be sure to devote particular attention to the issues of cost-benefit analysis and the review process.

As part of our implementation of Executive Order 13777, on April 11, 2017, the EPA established a Regulatory Reform Task Force and launched a robust request for public feedback on its evaluation of existing regulations. Program offices held 11 public meetings to receive input that could inform the regulatory review. More than 200,000 stakeholders were independently invited to participate, and nearly half a million comments were received in the public comment docket. This enthusiastic response from homeowners, small businesses, small governments, and other regulated entities has provided a springboard for identifying unnecessary and overly burdensome regulations.

The calculation of a regulation's costs and benefits is a vital component of the rulemaking process. Assumptions and procedures must be transparent and supported by the best available science and economics. The use of such obscure metrics as the "social cost of carbon" and "co-benefits" undermines regulatory certainty and imposes unnecessary costs on American citizens and businesses. In recognition of these facts, Executive Order 13783 directed Administrator Pruitt to review the use of the social cost of carbon and withdrew several policy documents based on it.

Finally, Congress has established statutory review processes that reflect the best interests of our country. The Unfunded Mandate Reform Act (P.L. 104-4) and the Regulatory Flexibility Act (P.L. 96-534) ensure that the interests of small businesses and different levels of government are incorporated into the rulemaking process. Additionally, the Executive Branch established another safeguard against federal overreach in Executive Order 13132: Federalism. These review processes were set in place for a reason and must be incorporated into EPA regulations.

Thank you again for your letter and partnership in the work of the EPA. We greatly appreciate your leadership on the Senate Committee on the Environment and Public Works and look forward to joining

together to make the federal government work better for the American people. If you have further questions, please contact me or your staff may contact Thea Williams in the EPA's Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations at williams.thea@epa.gov or (202) 564-2064.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Samantha K. Dravis". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized "S" and "D".

Samantha Dravis
Senior Counsel and Associate Administrator



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

JUN 23 2017

OFFICE OF
POLICY

The Honorable John Boozman
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Boozman:

Thank you for your letter regarding the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's efforts in response to Executive Orders 13777 and 13783. As part of President Trump's agenda, we are evaluating a variety of ways to bring more balance to the work of the Agency. In particular, we are refocusing the EPA on its intended mission, restoring cooperative federalism, and redesigning sensible regulations for economic growth while protecting the environment for future generations. As we develop regulatory policies, we will be sure to devote particular attention to the issues of cost-benefit analysis and the review process.

As part of our implementation of Executive Order 13777, on April 11, 2017, the EPA established a Regulatory Reform Task Force and launched a robust request for public feedback on its evaluation of existing regulations. Program offices held 11 public meetings to receive input that could inform the regulatory review. More than 200,000 stakeholders were independently invited to participate, and nearly half a million comments were received in the public comment docket. This enthusiastic response from homeowners, small businesses, small governments, and other regulated entities has provided a springboard for identifying unnecessary and overly burdensome regulations.

The calculation of a regulation's costs and benefits is a vital component of the rulemaking process. Assumptions and procedures must be transparent and supported by the best available science and economics. The use of such obscure metrics as the "social cost of carbon" and "co-benefits" undermines regulatory certainty and imposes unnecessary costs on American citizens and businesses. In recognition of these facts, Executive Order 13783 directed Administrator Pruitt to review the use of the social cost of carbon and withdrew several policy documents based on it.

Finally, Congress has established statutory review processes that reflect the best interests of our country. The Unfunded Mandate Reform Act (P.L. 104-4) and the Regulatory Flexibility Act (P.L. 96-534) ensure that the interests of small businesses and different levels of government are incorporated into the rulemaking process. Additionally, the Executive Branch established another safeguard against federal overreach in Executive Order 13132: Federalism. These review processes were set in place for a reason and must be incorporated into EPA regulations.

Thank you again for your letter and partnership in the work of the EPA. We greatly appreciate your leadership on the Senate Committee on the Environment and Public Works and look forward to joining

together to make the federal government work better for the American people. If you have further questions, please contact me or your staff may contact Thea Williams in the EPA's Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations at williams.thea@epa.gov or (202) 564-2064.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Samantha K. Dravis". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Samantha Dravis
Senior Counsel and Associate Administrator